DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 371 510 EC 303 097

AUTHOR Bailey, Carroll R., Jr.; And Others
TITLE An Investigation of Resistance to Teacher Collaboration--Knowledge with Which To "Fix What's Broken."
PUB DATE [93]
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Strategies; Cooperative Programs; *Disabilities; Educational Change; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Secondary Education; *High Risk Students; Problem Solving; *Resistance to Change; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teamwork
IDENTIFIERS *Teacher Collaboration

ABSTRACT

This study conducted a literature review concerning the use of teacher collaboration as a problem-solving process intended to provide educational services to students at risk and with disabilities. Various types of resistance to collaborative service delivery were grouped in the following categories: knowledge, skills, and training perceptions of collaboration; administrative involvement; volunteerism; time and scheduling; disincentives and workloads; crisis management; role ambiguity; status quo; funding and resources; students; parents; and preparation, planning, and evaluation. A questionnaire was then developed and used in conducting a survey of 144 teachers and 11 administrators. Findings indicated that educators agreed that involvement with collaboration does not diminish an individual's professional status or result in inferior services to students; teachers need more training to collaborate effectively and need information on instructional modifications used in teacher collaboration; the outcome of collaboration is largely dependent on a teacher's communication skills; and school administrators support collaboration. Respondents felt that collaboration was best used for problem prevention and addressing present problems. The paper concludes that the reasons behind resistance to collaboration are many and varied, differing somewhat as a function of professional discipline (administrator, special educator, regular educator). (Contains 22 references.) (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 371 510

An Investigation of Resistance to Teacher Collaboration--

Knowledge with which to "Fix What's Broken"

Carroll R. Bailey, Jr.

Director of Special Education and Services

Portsmouth, VA

Portsmouth City Public Schools

Nancy L. Arllen

Graduate Research Assistant

Old Dominion University

Robert A. Gable

Professor of Child Study/Special Education

Old Dominion University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert A. Gable

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running head: RESISTANCE

Please address all correspondence to Robert A. Gable, Ph.D., Professor of Child Study/Special Education, College of Education, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529-0136.

EC 303097

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

An Investigation of Resistance to Teacher Collaboration--
Knowledge with which to "Fix What's Broken"

Few reform initiatives have captured the imagination of the educational community as thoroughly as teacher collaboration (Friend & Cook, 1992a). Simply put, collaboration brings adults together in a problem solving process which is intended to provide educational services to students at-risk and with disabilities (Friend & Bauwens, 1988). Teacher collaboration is characterized by a host of special qualities--volunteerism, parity, trust, as well as a sense of shared responsibility (among others) (e g , Friend & Cook, 1992b). Findings of a modest amount of research underscore various benefits of serving students at-risk and with disabilities within the general education classroom through teacher collaboration (e g , Chalfant & Pysh, 1989, Polsgrove & McNeil, 1989). Nonetheless, resistance to collaboration is not uncommon, as evidenced by the frequency of teacher apprehension, reticence, or even hostility (e g , Kurpius, 1991, Margolis & McGettigan, 1988). In some cases, resistance to collaboration persists even after repeated attempts at some resolution (Friend & Bauwens, 1988). In spite of the frequency and, at times, tenacity of teacher resistance to collaboration, its exact origins remain largely unknown

Changes in Public Education

A number of social, political, and economic forces have converged to alter significantly the face of public education (Gable, Bailey, & Hendrickson, 1992). In the past, the vast majority of students with disabilities were excluded from receiving instruction with their nondisabled counterparts, in many instances, they were denied schooling completely (Meyen, 1989). By the 1960s, the human rights movement which initially focused on adults was extended to the rights of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

children and the handicapped (Hart & Pavlovic', 1991). More recently, the mainstreaming movement has decreased dramatically the longstanding practice of separating students according to the "two box" system of general and special education.

With the evolution of the mainstreaming movement, students with exceptionalities are receiving new educational opportunities but not without some difficulties. As a result of the steady movement of students with disabilities into regular classrooms, today more than two-thirds of all special education students receive some instruction in general classrooms (Annual Report to Congress, 1993). Students who previously would have been referred for "pull-out" services (i.e., self contained classroom) now are taught on a "stay-put" basis in the regular classroom (Will, 1986). While the changes in classroom placement are hailed as a necessary step in lowering barriers separating general and special education (e.g., Stainback & Stainback, 1984; Will, 1986), the growing diversity of the school age population increases the challenges facing regular classroom teachers. In fact, teachers in regular education settings confront burgeoning numbers of students--variously described as "difficult-to-teach," "slow learner," or "under achievers," who fail to qualify for special services but who exhibit serious learning and adjustment problems (Schrag, 1990). In all, there is ample reason to believe that as much as 30% of the regular education population may require some kind of adaptive instruction (Will, 1986).

New Roles and Responsibilities for Teachers

Changes in the composition of the regular classroom population have forced a redefinition of the roles and responsibilities of public school personnel (Gable et al., 1992). In the past, teachers generally were confined to their classrooms, with scant opportunity to interact with or to

learn from colleagues, today, they are being cast in the role of "peer coach," "cooperative teacher," and "teacher assistance team member." General and special classroom teachers and administrators alike are being called upon to facilitate collaborative endeavors with each other and with persons representing other professional disciplines (e.g., school psychologists, guidance counselors, speech and language therapists). Unfortunately, few educators have had sufficient training to work effectively with colleagues to improve the instruction of students with disabilities or special needs (Brown, Gable, Hendrickson, & Algozzine, 1991; Friend, 1988).

Resistance to Teacher Collaboration

By most accounts, teacher collaboration represents a promising means for meeting the diverse educational needs of students at-risk and students with disabilities in mainstream settings (e.g., Huefner, 1988). For this reason, there is mounting sentiment that teacher collaboration should occupy a more dominant role among service delivery options (Curtis & Meyers, 1989). Yet achieving that goal often is hampered by resistance on the part of teachers and administrators (e.g., Margolis & McGettigan, 1988).

Resistance to emerging collaborative arrangements has taken many forms, ranging from subtle, passive resistance to active, confrontive refusal (Friend & Bauwens, 1988). Unfortunately, no simple explanation exists why so many teachers seem reluctant to join with their colleagues to collaborate on behalf of special needs students or why some administrators are slow to support such a coalition. Various reasons offered for the widespread resistance to teacher collaboration have included scheduling difficulties, lack of time, and fear of the unknown (e.g., Friend & Bauwens, 1988; Harris & Cancelli, 1991; Kurpius, 1991). Although there is considerable evidence to suppport the value of collaboration, resistance to it remains a significant problem

(Margollis & McGettigan, 1988; Friend & Bauwens, 1988; Kurpius, 1991). Therefore, the purpose of this study was to survey educators (across area of certification, grade level and years teaching), to uncover possible sources of resistance to collaboration in the schools. Since "you can't fix it until you know how it's broken," knowledge surfacing from this investigation might caste new light on the complex issue of resistance to collaboration.

Method

A critical review was conducted of various bodies of professional literature to identify types of resistance to collaboration. Sources included Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC), articles published in special education and related journals during the past 10 years, and textbooks dealing with the subject of resistance in collaborative service delivery. After a review of the literature, the various types of resistance were grouped together to reflect major areas of resistance. Issues were grouped according to identifiable themes that surfaced from our review including: knowledge, skills, and training; perceptions of collaboration; administrative involvement; volunteerism; time and scheduling; disincentives and workloads; crisis management; role ambiguity; status quo; funding and resources; students; parents; preparation, planning, and evaluation.

Instrument

A two-part questionnaire was developed, field-tested (on a sample of general and special educators and administrators not participating in the study), and subsequently revised to improve its technical adequacy. Part I dealt with demographic data on gender, training level, years teaching, grade level, college courses on special needs students, and area of certification. The second part consisted of a 78-item closed-ended questionnaire to which participants responded

with a four-level Likert scale (ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"). Questions were grouped according to the previously identified 13 clusters (see methods section).

Participants

Eleven schools--six elementary, two middle, and three high schools were randomly selected from a large southeastern school district comprised of urban and suburban schools. From that group, a second random sample was chosen of special educators, general educators, and administrators . Our survey produced 144 teacher and 11 administrator respondents. Demographic data revealed eighty-one percent of the respondents were female. Among the respondents, 36% held bachelors degrees, 24% masters degrees and three percent held a CAS. Nearly one quarter (26%) had never taken a college course on special needs students, whereas, nearly forty percent (38 %) had three or more courses. Forty percent of the respondents were within 36 and 45 years old followed by twenty-six percent between 26 and 35 years. The greatest percentage of participants (42%) had 13 or more years of experience, and the balance were approximately equally distributed across the lower ranges of years. Eleven participants recorded administrative certificates, 92 held regular education certificates, and 47 were certified in special education.

Procedure

A one-time mail distribution was used to obtain responses to the questionnaire. A packet was sent to one special educator at each site who was asked to distribute a questionnaire and cover letter to a list of randomly selected general and special educators and the administrator (all located within the same school). Questionnaires were distributed and collected by the identified special educator at each site and returned through the school district mail system.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Results

In all, questionnaires were completed and returned by 144 teachers and 11 administrators. Two independent scorers checked the responses on all forms, which yielded a 100% interrater agreement. Each questionnaire item was evaluated with respect to three factors, area of professional certification, grade level taught, and years teaching. Scoring of the instrument involved giving each response a numbered weight (1-strongly agree, 2-agree, 3-disagree, 4-strongly disagree)

The mean and standard deviation were determined for each of the 78 questions for administrators, general educators, and special educators. Questions were analyzed in three ways: those with means equal to or greater than 3.0 for all groups (e.g., administrators, regular educators, and special educators), those with all means equal to or less than 2.0, and those with any notable patterns (e.g., bipolar distributions, all means and standard deviations the same). The same process of data comparison was used for analyzing years teaching and the grade level taught. Means, standard deviations and the number of responses (N) for each numbered question are presented in Table 1 for analysis by certification, in Table 2 for analysis by grade level, and in Table 3 for analysis by years teaching. (N is included in tables to allow consideration of differing response numbers due to blank or inadmissable responses.)

Insert Tables 1, 2, and 3 about here

Concurrence Across Certification Area, Grade Level, and Years Teaching

Disagree or strongly disagree. Three questions (numbers 14, 19, and 43) received means equal or greater than three for all categories across certification, grade level, and years teaching. With slight wording differences, questions 14 and 43 both expressed the idea that involvement with collaboration will diminish an individual's professional status. The means, high response rates, and modest standard deviations for this question suggest that educators reject the notion that involvement with collaboration is a professional liability. The means across certification areas, grade levels, and years teaching suggest that educators disagree that involvement in collaboration may result in inferior services to students (question 19). Although all means for question 19 were three or higher, the standard deviation was 0.9 for administrators and 0.0 for those working in pre-k settings--a substantial difference.

Strongly agree or agree. Educators expressed means of two or below (strongly agree or agree) across all categories for ten questions (3,5,6,7,11,18,23,25,61,72). Across groups, educators agreed that teachers need more training to collaborate effectively (question 3). Those working with grades Pre-K exhibited the strongest agreement (lowest mean, 1.2) and smallest standard deviation 0.4. Professionals across all categories also agreed that more information is needed on instructional modifications used in teacher collaboration (question 5). Interestingly, those respondents who produced the lowest means (the strongest agreement) were educators at the Pre-K level. Educators in each category also expressed a need for more information on classroom modifications that often are used in collaborative arrangement (question 6) and agreement that the outcome of collaboration is largely dependent on a teacher's communication skills (question7). Overall, educators expressed the belief that collaboration is based on

teamwork among professionals (question 11) and that they will be successful if they collaborate with their peers (question 18). In the area of administrative involvement, educators expressed agreement that the school administrators supported collaboration (question 23). The mean for question 25 suggests that educators generally have one administrator to whom they can turn for advise and support with respect to collaboration. However, the range of standard deviations (0.3 to 0.9) implies that there may be some who feel administrative support is not optimal. Two additional questions received overall agreement. That is, educators believed teachers are responsible for all of the students in their class whether mainstreamed or regular (question 61) and that parents need to be involved in mainstreaming (question72).

Within the analysis by certification, questions 9 and 10 expressed nearly identical responses, both in agreement that collaboration is best used for problem prevention and best used for present problems. Across grade level and of teaching years, though a small amount of variance was reflected in the mean, most educators concurred. While the two questions appear to be mutually exclusive, it is possible educators find collaboration to be effective for both problem prevention and for addressing present problems and opted to select both as "best" rather than reject one as "not best."

When asked whether teachers should add ss needs of the entire class rather than individual student needs (question 21), when analyzed by certification area results showed that all respondents disagreed. When analyzed by grade and years teaching, most but not all disagreed. Most educators disagreed with question 33, "I am reluctant about making special accommodations for mainstreamed students."

Question 15 asks whether it would be difficult to collaborate with a colleague who does not share the same teaching style or philosophy. When analyzed across grade levels, the lowest mean indicating greatest agreement came from those working with pre-k students; whereas, the highest mean came from those working with grades 10 to 12.

Discussion

Teacher collaboration is widely viewed as being in the forefront of educational reform of America's schools (Friend & Cook, 1992b). But, despite its growing popularity, there is unmistakeable resistance among many educators to collaboration--the exact nature of which is essentially unknown. Results of this study may help pinpoint the reasons for resistance to collaboration so that the problem may be properly addressed.

Findings from the present study support the opinion that teachers need additional training in collaboration, along with information on instructional and classroom modifications to use with collaboration (Margolis & McGettigan, 1988). These results add further credence to Baker and Zigmond's (1992) assertion that few regular classroom teachers are properly equipped to instruct students with special needs. Results are also consistent with those of Brown and colleagues (1991) who found that teachers make few curricular adjustments on behalf of their students. Further, findings of the present study add credence to those of Brown et al. (1991) who found that teachers of younger students are more receptive to student accommodations than are teachers of older students.

Special and general educators concur that involvement in a collaborative relationship does not mar an individual's professional status among colleagues. These perceptions are useful in light of anecdotal information that some teachers fear involvement in collaboration may result in

being perceived as a teaching assistant rather than as a full professional. General and special educators were in essential agreement that collaboration is an effective problem solving process and one that is likely to be successful . The importance of effective communicatjon skills in collaboration was recognized as well across disciplines. Conflicting teacher responses that collaboration is "best for problem prevention" and "best to address present problems" cannot be resolved from the findings surfacing from the present study. It is possible the questions were not understood or that because of generally positive feelings toward collaboration, educators chose to select both alternatives as appropriate.

In contrast to those of general and special educators, there was greater dispersion in administrators' responses when asked whether collaboration might result in inferior services to students. While our findings suggest a general consensus among teachers that collaboration does not provide less desirable services for students, some administrators remain skeptical. There are a number of possible explanations for that skepticism. For example, administrators are responsible for oversight of the complete educational program. Consequently, they may view collaboration as a useful process for some but not all situations. Furthermore, some administrators may agree in theory with the process of collaboration, but recognize simulaneously its limitations under present constraints (e g , limitations of time and scheduling; insufficient training for some teachers). In addition, collaboration has evolved over time. There may be administrators who view the collaborative process as potentially desirable but are aware of past difficulties when collaboration was first initiated. From such a perspective, an administrator could agree that collaboration may result in inferior services to some students but, at the same time, support its continued implementation. Alternatively, it is possible that some administrators may have

questions about the effectiveness of collaboration, owing to limited knowledge of the process itself. This would be consistent with survey results (question 4) which indicated that school administrators acknowledge the need exists for more administrator training to facilitate collaboration in schools. There is general agreement that administrator support is fundamental to successful collaboration. In light of this finding, the reservations expressed by some administrators regarding the collaborative process may be especially significant.

In sum, the reasons behind resistance to collaboration in the school are many and varied, differing somewhat as a function of professional discipline (e.g., administrator, special educator, regular educator). For some, resistance is borne out of the longstanding separation of general and special education which has led to numerous misconceptions regarding students with disabilities. For others, it may stem from uncertainty over the origin of student disabilities, the relationship between various categories of exceptionality and specific learner characteristics, and how to accommodate diverse student needs. If we are to alter these misconceptions, then significant changes must be made in the way teachers perceive student disabilities--change that is especially difficult. Margolis and McGettigan (1988) underscored that very fact, suggesting that resistance of teachers to "redo, rethink, and reanalyze" established practices is both natural and a significant challenge. As Gable, Korinek, and Laycock (1993) indicate, "...the demands associated with peer collaboration provide both administrators and classroom teachers legitimate grounds to resist" (p. 451). The present study goes beyond speculation regarding potential sources of resistance to teacher collaboration. Teachers expressed specific needs for instruction in both the "process" (e.g., problem solving, communication skills) and "tools" (e.g., classroom management, curricular modification) with which to collaborate with their peers. The call for training in methods of

change as well as the instruments of change underscore the importance of bringing general education, special education, and administrators together for the bulk of their training.

References

Brown, J., Gable, R.A., Hendrickson, J.M., & Algozzine, B. (1991). Prereferral intervention practices of regular classroom teachers: Implications for regular and special education preparation. Teacher Education and Special Education, 14, 192-197.

Chalfant, J.C., & Pysh, M.V.D. (1989). Teacher assistance teams: Five descriptive studies on 96 teams. Remedial and Special Education, 10, 49-58.

Curtis, M.J., & Meyers, J. (1989). Consultation: A foundation for alternative services in the schools. In J.L. Graden, J.E. Zins, & M.J. Curtis (Eds.), Alternative educational delivery systems: Enhancing instructional options for all students. (pp. 35-48). Washington, D.C.: National Association of School Psychologists.

Friend, M. (1988). Putting consultation into context: Historical and contemporary perspectives. Remedial and Special Education, 9, 7-13.

Friend, M., & Bauwens, J. (1988). Managing resistance: An essential consulting skill for learning disabilities teachers. Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21, 556-561.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992a). The ethics of collaboration. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 3, 181-184.

Friend, M., & Cook, L. (1992b). Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals. New York: Longman.

Gable, R.A., Bailey, C.R., Jr., & Hendrickson, J.M. (1992). Inservice preparation of regular and special educators to share responsibility for teaching all students. Teacher Educator Journal, 3, 1-10.

Gable, R.A., Korinek, L., & Laycock, V. K. (1993). Collaboration in the schools: Ensuring success. In J.S. Choate (Ed.), Successful mainstreaming: Proven ways to detect and correct special needs (pp. 450 - 469). Boston: Longwood.

Harris, A.M., & Cancelli, A.A. (1991). Teachers as volunteer consultees: Enthusiastic, willing, or resistant participants? Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 2, 217-238.

Hart, S.N., & Pavlovic, Z. (1991). Children's rights in education: An historical perspective. School Psychology Review, 20, 345-358.

Hodgkinson, H. (1991). Reform versus reality. Kappan, 73, 8-16.

Huefner, D.S. (1988). The consulting teacher model: Risks and opportunities. Exceptional Children, 54, 403-414.

Kurpius, D.J. (1991). Why collaborative consultation fails: A matrix for consideration. Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation, 2, 193-195.

Margolis, H., & McGettigan, J. (1988). Managing resistance to instructional modifications in mainstreamed environments. Remedial and Special Education, 9, 15-21.

Meyen, E.L. (1989). Exceptional children in today's schools. Denver: Love.

Polsgrove, L., & McNeil, M. (1989). The consultation process: Research and practice. Remedial and Special Education, 10, 6-20.

Reisberg, L. & Wolf, R. (1986). Developing a consulting program in special education: Implementation and intervention. Focus on Exceptional Children, 19, 1-14.

Schrag, J. (1990). Charting the course for the 1990s. In L.M. Bullock & R.I. Simpson (Eds.). Monograph on critical issues in special education: Implications for personnel preparation. (pp. 2-8). Denton, TX: University of North Texas.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. Exceptional Children, 51, 102-111.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). Fifteenth annual report to Congress on the implementation of The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Will, M. (1986). Educating children with learning problems: A shared responsibility. Exceptional Children, 52, 411-415.

Table 1.

Analysis by Certification - Disagree or Strongly Disagree
(M ≥ 3 for all Categories)

	Admin			Regular			Special		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Perceptions of Collaboration									
14. Lower professional status	3.5	0.5	11	3.1	0.6	90	3.3	0.6	47
16. Impedes best teaching	3.2	0.7	10	3.1	0.6	89	3	0.7	47
19. Inferior student services	3.3	0.9	11	3.1	0.5	91	3.2	0.7	46
21. Address all, not individual	3	0.7	11	3	0.7	86	3	0.7	47
Disincentives									
33. Reluctant to accommodate	3	0.7	11	3	0.7	89	3.1	0.7	41
42. Unwilling to collaborate	3.2	0.6	11	3	0.6	84	3.1	0.5	45
43. Lower professional status	3.4	0.5	11	3.1	0.5	91	3.1	0.5	46
44. Result in inferior services	3.3	0.4	11	3	0.7	89	3.1	0.7	47
Role Ambiguity									
55. Colleagues will criticize	3.1	0.5	10	3.1	0.5	90	3.1	0.6	46

Analysis by Certification - Strongly Agree or Agree
(M ≤ 2 for all Categories)

	Admin			Regular			Special		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Knowledge/Skills/Training									
1. I understand collaboration	1.4	0.5	11	2	0.7	92	1.6	0.5	46
3. Teachers need more training	1.4	0.5	11	1.7	0.6	92	1.4	0.7	47
4. I need more training	1.9	0.7	11	1.9	0.6	92	2	0.8	47
5. Instructional modifications	1.4	0.5	11	1.7	0.5	92	1.6	0.6	47
6. Classroom modifications	1.6	0.5	11	1.7	0.5	90	1.8	0.6	46
7. Communications skills	1.3	0.4	11	1.7	0.6	92	1.4	0.6	47
Perceptions of Collaboration									
10. Best for present problems	2	0.4	11	2	0.6	88	1.9	0.6	46
11. Professional teamwork	1.3	0.4	11	1.6	0.5	92	1.2	0.4	47
18. Successful collaboration	1.6	0.4	11	1.8	0.6	84	1.7	0.6	47
Administrative Involvement									
23. Mine supports collaboration	1.4	0.5	11	1.9	0.6	85	1.6	0.5	42
24. School-wide policy support	1.3	0.5	3	1.9	0.6	91	1.5	0.6	47
25. One supports collaboration	1.5	0.5	11	1.8	0.7	91	1.6	0.5	40
Time Scheduling									
31. Planning during school	2	0.7	11	1.7	0.6	91	1.5	0.6	47
Status quo									
61. Responsible for all students	1.5	0.7	11	1.7	0.6	91	1.5	0.6	47
Parents									
72. More involvement needed	1.7	0.4	11	1.9	0.6	89	1.6	0.6	47
Prepare/Plan/Evaluate									
75. Need school-wide teams	1.6	0.6	11	2	0.7	87	1.5	0.5	45

Table 1 cont'd

Analysis by Certification - Special Aspects to be Noted

	Admin			Regular			Special		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Perceptions of Collaboration									
9. Best for problem prevention	2	0.4	11	2	0.7	88	2.1	0.7	46
10. Best for present problems	2	0.4	11	2	0.6	88	1.9	0.6	46
21. Address entire class needs	3	0.7	11	3	0.7	86	3	0.7	47
Disincentives									
33. Reluctant to accommodate	3	0.7	11	3	0.7	89	3.1	0.7	41

Table 2.

Analysis by Grade - Disagree or Strongly Disagree (M ≥ 3 for all Categories)

	Pre-K			K-3			4-6			7-9			10-12		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Perceptions of Collaboration															
14. Lower professional status	3.2	0.4	5	3.2	0.6	63	3.3	0.7	19	3.3	0.5	17	3.1	0.9	16
19. Inferior student services	3	0	5	3.1	0.6	63	3.1	0.7	20	3.4	0.5	16	3.3	0.6	16
Disincentives															
43. Lower professional status	3.2	0.4	5	3.1	0.5	61	3.1	0.6	21	3.2	0.5	17	3.1	0.5	16
Role Ambiguity															
55. Colleagues will criticize	3.4	0.5	5	3.1	0.5	63	3.1	0.5	21	3.4	0.5	16	3.1	0.3	14
Students															
67. Fails academic needs	3	0	4	3	0.7	63	3	0.7	21	3.1	0.4	16	3.1	0.6	15

Analysis by Grade - Strongly Agree or Agree (M ≤ 2 for all Categories)

	Pre-K			K-3			4-6			7-9			10-12		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Knowledge/Skills/Training															
1. I understand collaboration	1.6	0.5	5	1.9	0.6	62	2	0.7	21	1.6	0.5	17	2	0.9	16
3. Teachers need more training	1.2	0.4	5	1.7	0.7	63	1.6	0.6	21	1.6	0.6	17	1.6	0.6	16
5. Instructional modifications	1.4	0.5	5	1.7	0.6	63	1.6	0.5	21	1.7	0.5	17	1.9	0.7	16
6. Classroom modifications	1.8	0.7	5	1.8	0.6	61	1.7	0.6	20	1.6	0.5	17	1.8	0.5	16
7. Communications skills	2	0.6	5	1.6	0.5	63	1.7	0.8	21	1.5	0.6	17	1.6	0.6	16
Perceptions of Collaboration															
11. Professional teamwork	1.2	0.4	5	1.5	0.5	63	1.3	0.5	21	1.4	0.5	17	1.6	0.5	16
18. Successful collaboration	1.8	0.4	5	1.7	0.5	59	2	0.7	18	1.8	0.6	17	1.8	0.4	16
Administrative Involvement															
23. Mine supports collaboration	1.4	0.5	5	1.8	0.5	59	1.9	0.7	20	1.8	0.5	16	1.9	0.6	12
25. One supports collaboration	1.4	0.5	5	1.8	0.6	61	1.9	0.9	19	1.9	0.3	15	1.8	0.8	14
Time Scheduling															
31. Planning during school	1.8	0.7	5	1.6	0.6	63	1.6	0.6	21	1.7	0.6	17	1.7	0.4	15
Status quo															
61. Responsible for all students	1.8	0.5	5	1.6	0.7	63	1.7	0.6	21	1.5	0.6	17	1.6	0.5	15
Parents															
70. Responsible for all students	2	0.6	5	1.6	0.6	63	1.9	0.8	21	1.6	0.6	17	1.9	0.8	14
72. More involvement needed	1.8	0.7	5	1.8	0.7	62	1.8	0.5	21	1.8	0.5	17	1.9	0.5	14
Prepare/Plan/Evaluate															
75. Need school-wide teams	2	0.9	5	1.9	0.7	60	2	0.7	21	1.7	0.5	15	1.7	0.7	14

Table 2 cont'd

Analysis by Grade - Special Aspects to be Noted

	Pre-K			K-3			4-6			7-9			10-12		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Perceptions of Collaboration															
15. Collaboration impediments	1.6	0.5	5	2.4	0.8	62	2	0.8	21	2.1	0.8	17	2.7	0.8	16
Administrative Involvement															
22. Central Admin. Supports	2.2	0.7	5	2	0.6	56	2.2	0.6	19	2.1	0.3	16	2	0.8	14
Disincentives															
33. Reluctant to accommodate	3.2	0.4	5	3	0.7	59	3	0.7	21	3.3	0.5	14	2.9	0.7	15

Table 3.

Analysis by Years Teaching - Disagree or Strongly Disagree (M ≥ 3 for all Categories)

	0-2			3-5			6-9			10-12			13+		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Perceptions of Collaboration															
14. Lower professional status	3	0.3	23	3.5	0.5	16	3.4	0.7	25	3.2	0.8	19	3.2	0.5	65
19. Inferior student services	3	0.3	23	3.3	0.6	16	3.1	0.8	26	3.1	0.7	19	3.2	0.6	64
Disincentives															
42. Unwilling to collaborate	3	0.3	21	3.1	0.5	14	3	0.6	25	3.1	0.6	17	3	0.6	63
43. Lower professional status	3	0.3	24	3.3	0.6	15	3.2	0.7	26	3.1	0.6	18	3.2	0.5	65
Students															
67. Fails academic needs	3	0.5	24	3.1	0.7	16	3.2	0.8	2.6	3.1	0.7	19	3	0.5	64
68. Fails soc./emot. needs	3	0.5	24	3	0.7	16	3.2	0.8	26	3.1	0.6	19	3	0.5	63

Analysis by Years Teaching - Strongly Agree or Agree (M ≤ 2 for all Categories)

	0-2			3-5			6-9			10-12			13+		
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N
Knowledge/Skills/Training															
3. Teachers need more training	1.5	0.7	24	1.4	0.5	16	1.5	0.7	26	1.6	0.8	19	1.8	0.6	65
4. I need more training	1.7	0.5	24	2	0.6	16	2	0.6	26	2	0.9	19	2	0.6	65
5. Instructional modifications	1.5	0.5	24	1.7	0.5	16	1.6	0.5	26	1.9	0.8	19	1.7	0.5	65
6. Classroom modifications	1.7	0.6	24	1.5	0.5	16	1.7	0.5	24	1.9	0.6	19	1.8	0.6	64
7. Communications skills	1.6	0.6	24	1.6	0.5	16	1.6	0.7	26	1.4	0.5	19	1.6	0.6	65
Perceptions of Collaboration															
11. Professional teamwork	1.5	0.5	24	1.4	0.5	16	1.3	0.4	26	1.3	0.5	19	1.6	0.5	65
18. Successful collaboration	1.9	0.3	23	1.5	0.5	15	1.9	0.7	24	1.9	0.7	18	1.8	0.5	62
Administrative Involvement															
23. Mine supports collaboration	1.9	0.6	22	1.7	0.5	14	2	0.6	26	1.6	0.6	18	1.7	0.5	57
24. School-wide policy support	1.7	0.5	23	1.8	0.7	16	1.5	0.7	26	1.5	0.5	17	1.9	0.5	60
25. One supports collaboration	1.9	0.6	24	1.6	0.5	15	1.8	0.7	24	1.4	0.6	17	1.8	0.7	62
Status quo															
61. Responsible for all students	1.8	0.5	24	1.5	0.6	16	1.5	0.6	26	1.3	0.4	19	1.8	0.7	64
70. Responsible for all students	1.9	0.6	24	1.5	0.6	16	1.7	0.8	26	1.4	0.5	19	1.8	0.7	64
72. More involvement needed w/Parents	1.7	0.5	24	1.7	0.8	15	1.5	0.5	26	1.8	0.8	19	2	0.5	64

BEST COPY AVAILABLE